COMMANDERS DIGEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE • WASHINGTON, D.C.

Vol. 4, No. 52 September 28, 1968

PROPERTY OF FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
OCT 18 1968

SEVEN MEDALS—Army Lt. Col. John W. Seigle receives the last of seven medals presented to him by Lt. Gen. John E. Kelly, Commandant, National War College, Washington, D.C., where Col. Seigle is a student. The medals, including the Silver Star, represent 30 citations for gallantry and leadership in Vietnam during a year-long tour that ended in February.

Adm. Moorer Outlines Challenges of Communism

Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, Chief of Naval Operations, has once again reaffirmed his belief that the major world-wide force challenging the men in uniform is communism.

In its avowed intent to dominate—ultimately—the world, this force has assumed many forms of violence, subversion, treachery and cold calculated aggression—in fact, the use of almost any means which might produce effective results, Adm. Moorer told the 50th convention of the American Legion in New Orleans, La., Sept. 11.

He said to cope with this continuing challenge, leaders of the Free World have been obliged to develop forces and strategies to prevent this aggression from swallowing the U.S. or its allies.

"As a result," he said, "today we are formally pledged to the collective security of over forty nations around the world, I underline the term collective security. Our alliances are not designed to crush the member allies' freedom but to preserve and defend it. The communism dictionary obviously has other meanings for the terms ally and collective security."

Referring to his position as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Adm. Moorer said he was concerned with

(Continued on page 3)

Clifford Sees Evidence Of Enemy Attempt At Third Offensive

Secretary of Defense Clark M. Clifford sees indications the enemy in Vietnam has tried to mount a third offensive, but that "spoiling tactics and strategy" used by Gen. Creighton W. Abrams (CG U.S. Forces Vietnam) have been very effective.

Secretary Clifford made this observation at a news conference following his appearance before the Subcommittee on Defense of the Senate Appropriations Committee Sept. 18.

He said the "threat is clearly not ended," and "we do not know specifically whether the enemy has been attempting to mount its third offensive."

He noted, however, that General Abrams' "spoiling operations" have prevented a number of attacks from taking place. Also, he said it is possible the enemy may have been trying to get a third offensive started but the action of our forces prevented it.

In answer to a question concerning national politics and the Vietnam war, Secretary Clifford said he does not now see any relationship at all between the military engagement or enemy strategy in Vietnam and the coming national elections in November.

Discussing NATO, he said it has been suggested by some of the NATO countries that it might be advisable to hold exercises of a military nature in NATO some time after the first of the year. "We are considering it," he said.

"If we were to participate at that time," he continued, "as I stated yesterday, we would send some 10,000 or 12,000 troops over there to take part in these military exercises. That

(Continued on Page 2)

Gen. Holloway Reports on SAC Readiness

The Strategic Air Command faces the challenge of building and maintaining in constant readiness a force capable of countering any nuclear threat to the national well-being of the United States.

And looking at it another way, the United States must first deter the enemy from initiating major hostilities using nuclear weapons and, second, be able to destroy his ability to sustain war, should he initiate hostilities.

Those observations were made by Gen. Bruce K. Holloway, Commander-in-Chief, Strategic Air Command, addressing the Omaha Chamber of Commerce, in Omaha.

General Holloway said, "I firmly believe the United States' strategic forces can assure delivery of sufficient weapons against primary Soviet and Chinese targets to cause them to reconsider any thought of nuclear attack against this nation."

He then outlined some of the challenges:

"By the end of this year, the Soviets will reach approximate numerical parity with the U.S. in terms of intercontinental ballistic missile launchers. They are developing and testing a fractional orbital bombardment system which adds new potential to their arsenal.

"Heavy bombardment aircraft and growing numbers of supersonic medium bombers are in operational service. Many are equipped with air-to-surface missiles.

"The number of Soviet submarine launched ballistic and cruise missiles has increased greatly in recent years. The short flight time to target of these missiles is a particularly dangerous threat to some of our deterrent forces.

"The Soviets have made a start toward deployment of an anti-ballistic missile system.

"Finally, Communist China has emerged as a potential strategic threat to us, thus complicating the complex problem of strategic balance."

Gen. Bruce K. Holloway

Explaining how SAC meets these challenges, Gen. Holloway said, "SAC has long recognized the principle of survivability and uses several techniques to insure the survival of the bulk of its strength—even under conditions of a surprise attack.

"For example," he said, "SAC's intercontinental ballistic missiles are kept on continuous alert—in steel reinforced concrete launchers — hardened enough to survive anything but a direct nuclear hit.

"SAC's combat aircraft, while not hardened, are dispersed at many bases in the United States and overseas. An attacking force would have to be very large to hit them all. About forty per cent of these aircraft are kept on continuous ground alert, able to take off safely within the warning time of an attack. As a further means of protection in periods of international tension, SAC can keep a significant part of the long-range B-52 heavy bomber force on 24-hour airborne alert, beyond the reach of enemy weapons."

General Holloway said that credibility is more subtle than survival because it is based on human psychology. He said credibility means "that the enemy must believe that our deterrent force not only is strong; he must believe that we will use it to destroy him if he attacks. He must be convinced of the resolve of our people and nation to remain free and to survive even under conditions of nuclear exchange."

"The final payoff, of course, depends on the weapons themselves," Gen. Holloway said. "We have about 600 B-52 and B-58 bombers supported by a similar number of KC-135 air refueling tankers. The tankers insure range extension of the bombers for complete target coverage. We have more than 1,000 Titan II and Minuteman Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles. The Navy's submarine-launched ballistic missiles, called Polaris, also make an important contribution to the over-all strategic mission."

This mixed force of bombers and intercontinental missiles, the general believes, provides the best means to accomplish the mission.

"Both systems have high reliability and the ability to get to the target," he said.

Third Offensive

(Continued from Page 1)

would give us a total of some 30,000 to 40,000 troops taking part in these military exercises. There is no present intention of increasing our military forces in NATO."

He said there had been no commitment made on new military hardware for NATO.

He added, he believed that sometime in the next few weeks there will be a meeting of NATO ministers and that contact is already going on now between the NATO countries and the United States in which this new threat is being carefully considered.

COMMANDERS DIGEST

THIS PUBLICATION CONTAINS OFFICIAL INFORMATION, NEWS AND POLICY, DIRECT FROM WASHINGTON AUTHORIZED SOURCES.

Published weekly by Armed Forces Press Service, 1117 N. 19th St., Arlington, Va. 22209, a unified activity of the Office of Information for the Armed Forces, OASD (M&RA). Reproduction of content is authorized. Suggested dateline for materials used is WASHINGTON (AFPS).

Adm. Moorer on Communist Challenge (Continued from Page 1)

the multiplicity of threats to our security.

"Some of these on the surface would appear to be completely non-military, such as the battle of the balance of payments and the war on poverty. I can assure you that the Department of Defense, as an instrument of our greater national policy, is very much concerned and involved in the entire spectrum of world affairs."

He said he meant that our national business, social welfare, and defense plans are written in such a way that they complement one another. In addition, he said, they are frequently rewritten to meet the complex and changing Free World 'total' security requirements.

Turning to the war in Vietnam, Adm. Moorer said "it is a war of prime example of America's support of an ally and of our firm reply to communist aggression and suppression."

He said he had just returned from a two-week inspection trip to Southeast Asia and would like to report to the legionnaires on the naval operation in Vietnam. "Of course," he said, "when I say Navy, I am always referring to the Navy-Marine Corps Team."

"At this moment, in the Northern First Corps area of South Vietnam, we have the largest concentration of Marines ashore in the history of our Navy-Marine Team—in the neighborhood of 84,000 . . ."

In addition to the Marines, "we have ashore in Vietnam, in support of these forces and related Navy commands, over 37,000 Navy personnel and about 1,200 Coast Guardsmen. (These include all ranks and rates; hospital corpsmen, chaplains, seabees, supply personnel, riverine force sailors, and all other skills required to coordinate with Navy at sea and support the forces ashore.)

"Directly off Vietnam's coast," Adm. Moorer continued, "we have the Seventh Fleet ships manned by an additional 35,000 Navymen.

"When it becomes necessary to launch air strikes into Vietnam, the first ones were flown from these Seventh Fleet aircraft carriers. Why? Simply because they were there; they were ready; they were operating on the free oceans, and they could be used immediately at the sole direction of our President."

The Admiral noted that during the last three years of combat operations in Southeast Asia, about half of all the combat missions over North Vietnam have been flown from the decks of Navy aircraft carriers.

Discussing Navy and Coast Guard sea surveillance and anti-infiltration patrol operations along the South Vietnamese coastline, Adm. Moorer mentioned an operation called 'Market Time' and said it was their job to prevent the communists from shipping either men or material into South Vietnam by sea.

Arm. Moorer also had praise for "Civil-War-style river operations in the Mekong River Delta and in other areas carried out by our 'Game Warden' River Patrol Forces in small fiberglass, water-jet powered boats supported by helicopters."

He said the joint Army-Navy Riverine Assault Force is the main strike force in the Delta area. Navy waterborne and airborne guns greatly multiply the mobile firepower of the Army's Ninth Infantry Division Brigades in this major rice growing area.

"In a thumbnail sketch," the Admiral said, "I might tell you that we have on the ground in Vietnam now, counting U.S. and allied forces a total of more than 600,000 men. Each month, ships transport to Vietnam one ton of food, clothing, and ammunition for each man ashore, a tribute to our Navy-Merchant Marine 'know-how' and management system. In the last year the Military Sea Transportation Service broke all records in their cargo operations, even surpassing previous peak Korean War records.

"The Navy Seabees have completed a billion dollar program of construction—the world's largest single construction program—in such places as Da Nang and Cam Ranh Bay to support these forces in a manner unimagined in any previous conflict."

CROSS OF GALLANTRY—Marine Sgt. Harvey E. Steiner (right) receives the Vietnamese Cross of Gallantry from Lt. Gen. Hoang Xuan Lam, I Corps Commander, in ceremonies at Da Nang. Sgt. Steiner was one of 27 members of the 3d Military Police Bn. who received the decoration.

Curbing the Spread of Nuclear Weapons

CROSSROADS IN ARMS CONTROL

Progress in the vital field of international control of nuclear weapons was recently discussed by William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and also U.S. Representative to the Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee.

Analyzing the significance of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, he pointed out that the treaty is not a Soviet-American agreement but a multilateral undertaking which seeks to promote security and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy on a worldwide basis. Some 80 countries have now signed the treaty. It has also been signed by President Johnson and is awaiting ratification by the Senate.

Below are excerpts from Mr. Foster's address of 18 September.

There really is no acceptable alternative to arms control and disarmament progress. Technology already has decided this issue for us.

You may recall that, after almost four years of painstaking and difficult negotiations [on the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty], at the beginning of this summer things seemed at last to be looking up.

The Non-Proliferation Treaty had received an overwhelming commendation from the United Nations General Assembly, and thus was well on its way toward becoming the most important step yet in our efforts to curb the spread of nuclear weapons.

Earlier Treaties

It was the logical follow-on, of course, to such earlier arms control measures as the limited test ban treaty and the treaties providing for what might be called "preventive denuclearization" of Antarctica, of Outer Space, and most recently, of Latin America.

Like all of these earlier measures the Non-Proliferation Treaty, having previously been regarded by many as a virtual impossibility, had finally come into being after long and arduous negotiations.

And when the treaty was opened for signature at a White House ceremony on July 1, President Johnson made an announcement of utmost significance. He announced that the Soviet Government had at last agreed to hold discussions on mutual limitations and possible subsequent reductions of strategic arms, both offensive and defensive.

To sum up: We had achieved important gains in preventing the geographic spread of nuclear weapons, and now we were preparing to move on to the even more difficult task of limiting the nuclear arms race between the Great Powers.

U.S. Public Opinion

Perhaps many people began to realize then for the first time that our arms-control efforts were getting somewhere. In any case it was soon apparent that the American people had grasped the significance of these developments. A nationwide Harris poll revealed that approximately 80 percent of Americans responded favorably to both events. Mr. Harris characterized this endorsement as "overwhelming."

And in July and early August, there were two other developments taking place—little noted but each promising in its way—in England and in Brazil.

In Brazil there was a meeting of the United Nations *Ad Hoc* Committee on the Peaceful Uses of the Seabed and Deep Ocean Floor which made progress toward the reservation of that increasingly important area for peaceful purposes only. The seabed is, of course, becoming ever more accessible to men, machinery, and nations; and so we are hoping to see steps taken which would prevent an extension of the nuclear arms race to this area.

"First Look" Verification Test

In England, meanwhile, some "serious make-believe," as it was referred to in the press, was taking place. Elements of the American and British armed forces were participating in the first international arms-control field test—developing techniques which would be useful in verifying compliance with agreed limitations on conventional forces, if and when such agreements become possible.

Although we had previously carried out arms-control field tests from time to time over a period of several years in the United States, this was the first *international* test, and so they called it FIRST LOOK.

The idea was to compare the effectiveness of ground inspection organizations of different sizes, with varying degrees of access to military installations, and with different kinds of equipment, in monitoring a hypothetical arms-control agreement. It also involved aerial surveil-

lance and the use, on the ground, of unattended sensors, surveying the activities of the "host" forces, which consisted of 30,000 British Army and Royal Air Force personnel.

As reported by *Christian Science Monitor* correspondent Carlyle Morgan, FIRST LOOK would "help answer some of the most important questions being asked about all proposed arms-control treaties . . . Can they be relied upon? How can they be made more reliable through policing without disturbing the peoples or authorities of nations unused to permitting foreigners to inspect national defense resources?"

While the findings of FIRST LOOK are not yet in, I expect that they will contribute substantially to our abilities for monitoring arms-control agreements.

To sum up, the general outlook for arms control and disarmament, in mid-summer, seemed brighter than it had for a long time; but from many experiences in the past we began to expect that, following the usual pattern, it was about time for some new obstacle to arise.

Invasion of Czechoslovakia

What happened was worse than anything one might reasonably have anticipated: namely, the invasion of Czechoslovakia.

This was such a fateful development that probably no one can foresee all of its implications even now. But one of the first questions asked—by people in government, by the press, and by the public—was: What effect will this have on arms control and disarmament negotiations? And you will doubtless recall that there were many somber reactions reported by the press, including predictions of "a 'really wild' increase in U.S. military spending over the next few years . . .," a cessation of any contact with the Soviet Union, and so on.

Now, we in the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency were naturally outraged, as have been people around the world, by this wanton attempt to destroy the budding freedom of the Czechs. But arms control is important at all times, particularly during times of crisis.

So what effect *has* the invasion of Czechoslovakia had on our arms-control endeavors?

Obviously it would be foolish to pretend that it has not been a setback. On the one hand, some countries have indicated that they now wish to pause further before signing the Non-Proliferation Treaty. On the other hand, the invasion has greatly complicated the preparations for bilateral talks on strategic nuclear systems with the Soviets. I would be quite unable to say at this time when these discussions may take place.

Why We Should Support Treaty

I would, however, like to emphasize at this time the importance of our continuing support for the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

According to one of its provisions, the Non-Proliferation treaty is to enter into force after deposit of ratification by the three depositary governments—the United States, the United Kingdom, and the Soviet Union—and 40 other signatory nations. Now, obviously this whole process is going to take some time.

Nevertheless . . . while a temporary delay in ratification on our part would not necessarily delay the final entry into force of the treaty, I certainly would not want to see it misinterpreted by other potential signatory governments. Indeed I pray that all other governments will understand very clearly that what is being discussed among American political leaders at this time is *not* whether we intend to ratify the treaty, but only the *timing* of Senate action.

It should be crystal clear to everyone that the United States of America continues to favor this treaty very strongly. This has been stated clearly and repeatedly by the President and the Secretary of State, and even by those who counsel a delay. Before the NPT even came into existence, the U.S. Senate, in 1966, voted 84-0 in favor of a resolution—the "Pastore Resolution"—which commended the President's efforts to obtain such a treaty.

Indeed, non-proliferation has been an important policy of the four Presidents of the United States who have been in office since the dawn of the nuclear age.

Not a Soviet-American Agreement

We favor this treaty not because we regard it as a Soviet-American agreement, which it is not, but because it is a multilateral undertaking, universal in nature, which seeks to promote security and the peaceful uses of nuclear energy on a worldwide basis.

The fact that the world community as a whole also regards it as such is attested to by the fact that the treaty has now been signed by some 80 countries. And incidentally, Czechoslovakia was among the first to sign. It signed when the treaty was opened for signature on July 1.

By no means the least of our reasons for favoring the Non-Proliferation Treaty, of course, is that it is aimed at reducing the likelihood of nuclear war, and it clearly serves our national security interests.

Of course, we have never regarded the Non-Proliferation Treaty as an end in itself but rather as one step—albeit an immensely important one—in a series.

The "safeguards" article of the treaty . . . for the first time establishes an obligatory international inspection system (to prevent the diversion of fissionable materials from peaceful purposes to weapons manufacture). Here is a very real precedent for more rational international relationships, a significant step toward the application of law in international life.

DCA Director Details Future of Satellite Communications

"The ability to meet the over-all program objectives and fully optimize the satellite communications technology in the Defense Satellite Communications system appears to be limited only by the imagination and resources applied by both industry and defense."

Lt. Gen. Richard P. Klocko, Director of the Defense Communications Agency, thus summarized the future of satellite communications in an address to a convention of Electronics and Aerospace Systems delegates in Washington.

General Klocko outlined what systems are in use today, what is expected in the near future and what could be in far reaching plans.

He said in the summer of 1967 the initial phase of our Defense Communications Satellite project was nearing completion and with notable results. "We recognized, however, that this phase provided a limited system." The satellites drifted and left gaps in communication, they were low-powered and limited in bandwidth and the earth terminals were limited in capability and operational reliability being research and development models.

"These limitations combine to provide very real boundaries to the utilization of the system which can be overcome only by the development of a new system," he explained. "With this goal in view, DCS began in 1965 to plan for a second generation Defense Communications Satellite program under the guidance of the Office of Defense Research and Engineering.

"But, why do we need a defense satellite communications system?" General Klocko asked. He pointed out that "As a matter of national policy, the need for a separate system is recognized by the inclusion of provisions within the communications satellite act of 1962 that permit the creation of '. . . additional communications satellite systems, if required to meet unique governmental needs or if otherwise required in the national interest.'

Lt. Gen. Richard P. Klocko

"The need for a separate defense system is to provide features that are most essential to the military—features that differentiate the defense from the commercial systems." He pointed out that these areas included: flexibility for rapid extension of service to new areas and ability to reconfigure the system; increased survivability from both electronic and physical attack; reliability/availability for high assurance of rapid special service; and security. "We also need the system to provide us with the capability to process other types of communication such as digital data and graphics that cannot be processed by commercial sytems either for reasons of economy or security."

"The twenty-six standard satellites now in the system are rudimentary and have the same relation to the Phase II system as the Model-T is to the present automobile industry. If any system may so be counted, this initial effort can be aptly classed as an inter-service success story of the first magnitude."

He continued, "However, of the 26 now in orbit, only eight will continue to function by 1972-73. The rest will have their components switch off automatically by then. The initial system has turned out extremely well for the most part, but a follow-on system is needed. It behooves us to get something up there to replace them soon—and by soon, I mean 1971—because all manner of things are apt to go wrong with them by then."

"Consequently, since 1965, we have been planning a follow-on program. Its objective was to furnish the national command authority and the military services with a future high-capacity, secure, strategic communications satellite network endowed with an ever higher degree of reliability, flexibility, survivability after an attack and immunity to enemy jamming. In the interests of economy, it is planned, generally speaking, to use the existing initial system earth facilities. The principal evolutionary advances are contained in the space elements of the system.

"Phase II must handle securely, and in considerable volume, practically every form of electronic communications, including: voice, teletype, computerized digital data, and video transmission. At all costs, Phase II must still support the national command authority promptly — instantaneously, if possible."

"We cannot afford long outages: a mere 15 minutes is all that elapses between the time a shower of nuclear-tipped ICBMs is first detected and the time it impacts," the DCA commander emphasized.

"For this new system, we intend to use the tried and proven class of synchronous satellite. Orbited at 19,200 nautical miles altitude, in an easterly direction, several of them will be interspersed around the earth's equatorial plane and will sustain a fixed station relative to earth's position.

"Where DCA's Phase II synchronous satellites are to differ from Phase I, however, will be in the quality and quantity of their performance, besides the way in which they perform. They will be steerable from the ground to help keep them fixed in space and avoid 'bunching,'" he pointed out.

"Each Phase II satellite will be equipped with two varieties of antenna; an earth coverage antenna direct-

(Continued on page 7)

NEW DEPUTY SURGEON GENERAL—Maj. Gen. Clenn J. Collins (right) is sworn in as Deputy Surgeon General of the Army by Judge Advocate Lt. Col. William C. Vinet Jr. (left). Surgeon General of the Army Lt. Gen. Leonard D. Heaton witnesses the ceremony.

Satellite Communications

(Continued from Page 6)

ing most of its radiated power towards earth so as to provide uniform coverage to all visible terminals and a narrow beam antenna that focuses its energy into a narrow beam covering a circle of earth's surface with a diameter of from one to two thousand miles. The small portion of earth covered by this antenna will give 100 times more power than the area would otherwise receive."

"Both antennas would handle hundreds of equivalent voice channels at a time. The concentration of radiated power provided by the narrow beams will enable us to establish these channels to give us the capability to quickly deploy ground terminals into new theaters of operation and rapidly establish vital communications into and within the theater to connect the headquarters of major commands or authorities. The Phase II satellite will hopefully give us the capability for the rapid build-up of command communications in contingency situations wherever required.

"In addition, the network of Phase II ground terminals will utilize the existing 36 initial system terminals in an upgraded condition. Also, new terminals will be bought so the total will about double the number in Phase I."

Concerning future developments, Gen. Klocko said, "I cannot help but believe that we are only setting up the basis for even greater accomplishments in the years ahead. Although Phase II should project us well into the 1970's, advancements in the state of the art will presumably continue to occur and thus we should begin our thinking now as to how best to meet the next generation requirement that is sure to come."

"We will be anxious to improve on board signal processing, we would eventually like to have a direct satellite to satellite communications relay capability and we would like to also exploit higher frequencies, if at all practicable. And, possibly, we might like to reorient the entire pattern of satellite communications from the frequency division to the time division mode of transmission."

'Deep Freeze 69' Antarctic Operation Begins October 8

During the next six months, men and supplies will move to the Antarctic by sea and air over an 11,000-mile supply line backing up the Navy's support for science program—"Operation Deep Freeze 69."

The first of these will move off Oct. 8, from Christchurch, New Zealand and move to McMurdo Station, Antarctica, to take advantage of the relatively favorable weather conditions of the Antarctic summer from October to March.

More than 2,000 men from the Navy, Coast Guard and other armed services, and members of more than a dozen specialized units, will take part in the program.

"Deep Freeze 69" is being conducted by the Navy's Task Force Forty-Three, commanded by Rear Admiral J. Lloyd Abbott Jr., headquartered in Washington.

There will be nearly 50 scientific projects conducted by the U.S. Antarctic Research Program (USARP) during this year's operations.

In addition to providing support for USARP projects, Deep Freeze will have additional highlights of its own. The continent's largest building, which will house McMurdo Station's entire winter-over population, will be completed.

More than ninety-five per cent of the supplies for American stations there are brought in by ships which reach McMurdo in January and February through a channel cut in the ice by Coast Guard icebreakers. The other five per cent is brought in by air.

Soon after the summer operating season begins, flights will be made by ski-equipped C-130 Hercules aircraft to open up the three inland stations—Byrd, South Pole and Plateau —on the continental icecap.

Palmer Station, situated on a small island off the Antarctic Peninsula, inaccessible by air, will be opened by Coast Guard icebreakers in mid-December.

DOD Schedules Test of New Menu Service

Regional food preferences such as grits, New England boiled dinner, chili con carne, lasagna, and seafood platters, to name a few, are going to be tested for a minimum of six months at selected forces installations beginning Oct. 1.

The Department of Defense Directorate for Food Service said Sept. 9 that the new menu service was developed by representatives of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps and is the first military menu designed to ensure that all members of the armed forces subsisting under comparable conditions are given uniform and equitable support, with quality and acceptability being the primary considerations.

The new menu service is scheduled to be tested at the following locations:

1—Army—Fort Sheridan, Ill.; Fort Lee, Va.; and Fort Bragg, N. C.

2—Navy—Naval Training Center, Great Lakes, Ill.; Naval Station, Norfolk, Va.; and Naval Air Station, Patuxent River, Md.

3—Air Force—Chandler Air Force Station, Minn.; Francis E. Warren AFB, Wyo.; Maxwell AFB, Ala.; McConnell AFB, Kans.; McGuire AFB, N. J.; and Webb AFB, Tex.

4—Marine Corps — Marine Corps Base, Camp Pendleton, Calif.; Marine Barracks, U. S. Naval Shipyard, Mare Island, Calif.; Headquarters and Service Bn., Camp Elmore, U. S. Navy Base, Norfolk, Va.; Marine Corps Supply Center, Albany, Ga.; Marine Corps Supply Center, Barstow, Calif.; and Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point, N. C.

The Army and Air Force currently use menus that are planned centrally for feeding their personnel on a worldwide basis. This menu concept, known by many Army and Air Force food service personnel as the "Master Menu," has been in use for more than 25 years. The Navy and Marine Corps publish menu guides to assist their food service personnel engaged in menu planning at each Navy and Marine Corps facility.

The new menu service test beginning Oct. 1, will continue for a minimum of six months. Specifically excluded will be special situations that may be necessary in shipboard feeding (such as submarine); in the field (such as combat), and in flight. During the test, service representatives will accumulate data to determine the extent it is feasible for each of the military services to utilize a standard menu.

The new menu service includes 42 different daily menus (breakfast, dinner, dinner/snack meal, and supper), along with a variety of holiday and special event menus.

The daily menus include a la carte breakfasts, a choice of entrees, vegetables, salads and desserts. In addition, the current trend for a short-order type meal rather than a complete meal is recognized by the inclusion of dinner/snack meal menus. These menus include, in addition to the proverbial "hamburger and french fries," such items as pizza, sloppy joes, chili dogs, fishwiches, etc.

In conjunction with the new menu service, an armed forces recipe service also has been developed jointly by the military services. Like the menu, it includes the more popular food items of service personnel and the most modern methods of preparation.

Both the armed forces menu service and the armed forces recipe service were developed as a result of a review of the military services food service program, conducted by the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Installations and Logistics, in coordination with the military services.

Under the cognizance of the Department of Defense Food Planning Board, the U. S. Army Food Service Center in Chicago was assigned the responsibility for the development of the menus. The Navy Subsistence Office in Washington, D. C., was assigned the responsibility for development of the recipes. Both assignments were accomplished with full participation of military service dieticians, food service technologists, and representatives of the food service industry as required.

AIR OPERATION OBSERVERS—Viewing air operations aboard the attack aircraft carrier USS Hancock are (l to r) RAdm. G. S. Morrison, commander, Carrier Division Nine; VAdm. W. F. Bringle, Commander, Seventh Fleet; Adm. J. J. Hyland, Commander-in-Chief, Pacific Fleet, and Capt. H. E. Greer, Hancock's CO. Adm. Hyland and Adm. Bringle visited the carrier for briefings with Adm. Morrison, Capt. Greer, and air wing officers concerning operations in the Gulf of Tonkin.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.
Price 5 cents (single copy). Subscription Price: $2.50 per year; $3.25 additional for foreign mailing.

☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1968-342-467 / A-13